

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 12/08/2009.
2. Claims 13-36 have been amended, and claims 1-12 were previously cancelled. Currently, claims 13-36 are pending.

***Response to Amendment***

3. Amendments to claims are effective to overcome the 101 rejections as presented in the previous Office action. Therefore, the previous 101 rejections have been withdrawn.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument (see Remarks, page 6) that Bergman does not disclose a TV-Anytime service system and Bergman does not disclose a TV-Anytime service, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

A TV-Anytime service system as recited can be broadly interpreted as any system including the functional components as recited. Similarly, a TV-Anytime service as recited can be broadly interpreted as any service/method including the functional steps as recited.

Art Unit: 2164

Therefore, if the system/method disclosed by Bergman includes the functional components/steps as recited, Bergman anticipated the TV-Anytime service system and the TV-Anytime service as recited. Examiner details how Bergman teaches the recited functional components/steps as recited in the following “Claim Rejections” section.

### ***Specification***

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: there is missing application number of the related Korean application at line 6, page 22. Appropriate correction is required.

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: there is no disclosure/definition of “processor readable storage medium”.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2164

8. Claims 21, 25 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the processor" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the processor" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 33 recites the limitation "the processor" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 13-36 (PCT filing date 12/17/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bergman et al. (US Patent No 6,564,263, Patent date 5/13/2003).

As to claim 13, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A TV-Anytime service system having a processor for providing a package wherein the package is composed of contents including a component or item” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] wherein a content server providing information anytime can be interpreted as equivalent to a TV-Anytime service system), the system comprising:

“a package metadata generating unit for generating package metadata including relation metadata describing temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 6, lines 57-65] and [column 15, lines 5-20] wherein the Inter Object Description Scheme describing both spatial and temporal relationships among multimedia objects is interpreted as package metadata and the multimedia content description framework generating/providing the Inter Object Description Scheme is interpreted as a package metadata generating unit; also see [column 7, lines 1-45] for InfoPyramid for Intra-object specification (package metadata)); and

“a providing unit for providing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 18, lines 25-40] for providing XML description over HTTP including both inter-object descriptions and InfoPyramid descriptions).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

As to claim 17, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A TV-Anytime service system having a processor for consuming a package wherein the package is composed of contents including a component or item” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] wherein a client devices receiving contents from the content server can be interpreted as equivalent to a TV-Anytime service system as recited), the system comprising:

“a package metadata obtaining unit for obtaining package metadata including relation metadata describing temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 55-62] and [column 19, lines 20-25] for transmitting to client devices multimedia content as well as its metadata (i.e., description data using MMCDF framework)); and

“an analyzing unit for analyzing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 19, lines 15-18] for analyzing multimedia content according to description schemes; also see [column 20, lines 34-37] for synthesizing multimedia content according to description scheme including the intra- and inter-objection relationship (metadata)).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

As to claim 21, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A processor readable storage medium with instruction stored thereon for a package providing method for providing a package wherein the package is composed of contents including a component or item wherein executing the instructions on the processor provides TV-

Art Unit: 2164

Anytime service steps of” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] wherein a content server provides contents to client devices):

“generating package metadata including relation metadata describing temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 6, lines 57-65] and [column 15, lines 5-20] for providing/generating the inter Object Description Scheme wherein the Inter Object Description Scheme describing both spatial and temporal relationships among multimedia objects is interpreted as package metadata; also see [column 7, lines 1-45] for InfoPyramid for Intra-object specification (package metadata)); and

“providing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 18, lines 25-40] for providing XML description over HTTP including both inter-object descriptions and InfoPyramid descriptions).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).



As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 23 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

As to claim 25, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A processor readable storage medium with instruction stored thereon for a package consuming method for consuming a package wherein the package is composed of contents including a component or item wherein executing the instructions on the processor provides TV-

Art Unit: 2164

Anytime service steps of” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] for receiving/consuming contents from the content server by client devices):

“obtaining package metadata including relation metadata describing temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 55-62] and [column 19, lines 20-25] for transmitting to client devices multimedia content as well as its metadata (i.e., description data using MMCDF framework)); and

“analyzing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 19, lines 15-18] for analyzing multimedia content according to description schemes; also see [column 20, lines 34-37] for synthesizing multimedia content according to description scheme including the intra- and inter-objection relationship (metadata)).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 27 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

As to claim 29, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A TV-Anytime service system having a processor for providing and consuming a package wherein the package is composed of contents including a component or item” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] for a system wherein the content server provides contents to client devices), the system comprising:

“a package providing apparatus” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] wherein the content server is interpreted as a package providing apparatus) comprising

“a package metadata generating unit for generating package metadata including relation metadata describing temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 6, lines 57-65] and [column 15, lines 5-20] wherein the Inter Object Description Scheme describing both spatial and temporal relationships among multimedia objects is interpreted as package metadata and the multimedia content description framework generating/providing the Inter Object Description Scheme is interpreted as a package metadata generating unit; also see [column 7, lines 1-45] for InfoPyramid for Intra-object specification (package metadata)) and

“a providing unit for providing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 18, lines 25-40] for providing XML description over HTTP including both inter-object descriptions and InfoPyramid descriptions.); and

“a package consuming apparatus” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 44-63] wherein the client device is interpreted as a package consuming apparatus) comprising

“a package metadata obtaining unit for obtaining the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 5, lines 55-62] and [column 19, lines 20-25] for transmitting to client devices multimedia content as well as its metadata (i.e., description data using MMCDF framework)) and

“an analyzing unit for analyzing the package metadata” (see Bergman et al., [column 19, lines 15-18] for analyzing multimedia content according to description schemes; also see

Art Unit: 2164

[column 20, lines 34-37] for synthesizing multimedia content according to description scheme including the intra- and inter-objection relationship (metadata)).

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 29 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).

As to claim 31, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 29 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Art Unit: 2164

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

As to claim 33, Bergman et al. teaches:

“A processor readable storage medium with instructions stored thereon, wherein executing instructions on the processor provides a TV-Anytime service relation metadata for describing relation between a plurality of contents including component or item, wherein the relation metadata describes temporal relation and spatial relation between the contents” (see Bergman et al., [column 6, lines 56-65] for description scheme (relation metadata) to describe relationships among multimedia objects, including both spatial relationship and temporal relationship).

As to claim 34, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 33 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

Art Unit: 2164

“wherein the temporal relation includes absolute temporal information or relative temporal information” (see Bergman et al., [column 15, lines 30-42] and [column 16, lines 20-60]).

As to claim 35, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 33 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative distance information” (see Bergman et al., [column 16, lines 60-67] and [column 17, lines 1-20] wherein spatial properties can be specified using relationship and acceptable ranges (relative distance information)).

As to claim 36, this claim is rejected based on the same reasons as given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Bergman et al. teaches:

“wherein the spatial relation includes relative size information according to a user interface” (see Bergman et al., [column 17, lines 1-40 and 49-54] for instance, Object B is within Object D (i.e., relative size information)).

***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571)272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner  
Art Unit 2164  
April 8, 2010